

FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,  
JAMES S. ATHON,  
OF Marion County.

FOR AUDITOR OF STATE,  
JOSEPH RISTINE,  
OF Fountain County.

FOR TREASURER OF STATE,  
MATTHEW L. BRETT,  
OF Daviess County.

FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
OSCAR B. HORD,  
OF Decatur County.

FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,  
SAMUEL L. RUGG,  
OF Allen County.

CONGRESSIONAL NOMINATIONS.

1st District—JOHN LAW.  
2d " JAMES A. GRAVES.  
3d " H. W. HARRINGTON.  
4th " W. S. HOLMAN.  
5th " B. CONDUIT.  
6th " D. V. VOORHEES.  
7th " DAVID TURKIE.  
8th " J. K. EDGERTON.

The Test.

The test of patriotism with the Republicans is the support of all the dogmas and acts of their party and their leaders. This is made manifest by the course of the *Journal* towards Messrs. HOLMAN and GRAVES. These members of Congress have unhesitatingly supported the vigorous prosecution of the war for the suppression of the rebellion. They voted for all the men and all the money asked for by the President and the Republican party. But in so doing they did not think they were called upon to repudiate their political principle, or desert their party associates. Both have been re-nominated by Democratic Conventions in their districts for re-election to Congress. This, with the *Journal*, is a great crime, and it attempts to throw a doubt upon the loyalty of these gentlemen because they will not bow the knee to the Republican calf. The Republicans adhere strictly to their party issues and party doctrines and insist upon approving to themselves all the civil patronage, and nearly all of the militia, at the disposal of the Administration, and the *Journal* thinks that all right. But a Democrat, supporting the vigorous prosecution of the war, is pronounced by the same Republican organ disloyal unless he lays down his principles and manliness upon the altar of Republicanism. That's the Republican test of loyalty.

Getting Worse.

A later dispatch than those published yesterday afternoon in our extra, states that the rebels have taken London, which cuts off communication with Cumberland Gap entirely and puts our force there in a most dangerous position. The communication with Nashville is also interrupted, and Buell's army is said to be in a very bad position. This state of things is just what might have been expected, and we shall not be at all surprised to hear of the loss of Buell's entire army. He is beyond all question the most utterly incapable, if not worse, General in the army, and the fact that he has been idle for months while the rebels were accumulating in his rear, ought to be enough to cashier him.—*Journal*.

We put the above on record.

The *Journal* condemns without knowing the situation of Buell or the objects in view which placed him where he is and the orders under which he is acting. He was subordinate to Gen. HALLACK as he now is to Gen. GRANT, and it is his duty to obey the orders of his superiors. Gen. BUELL fought with great bravery, skill and energy at the battle of Shiloh, and his timely arrival and generalship there turned the repulse, if not the annihilation of GRANT's army, into a victory. One thing is certain, Gen. Buell will give a good account of himself, and we yet expect to see the *Journal*, as it has already, sing hosannas to this "most utterly incapable, if not worse, General in the army."—*Journal*.

On Saturday last the *Journal* had the following in reference to another brave and gallant officer. Referring to the battle of Baton Rouge, it said:

The report of Gen. Williams' death may be true, and if it is it will cause little lamentation. He was utterly detested by his men, and it they fought under him at all, it was because they loved their country more than they hated him, and greater love than that no man can have for his country, for Williams had the most winning way to make men hate him that we ever heard of.

Now what say our reports of the battle at Baton Rouge?

Gen. Williams, who was killed, behaved like a hero. He had three horses shot under him, and was killed while rallying the 21st Indiana, who had just lost a field piece. \* \* \* Gen. Buell just issued a general order announcing, in eloquent language, the death of Gen. Williams. \* \* \* The funeral of Gen. Williams took place at New Orleans on the 8th, and was very impressive.

And this is the hero, whose death will "cause little lamentation," says the *Journal*.

In similar terms the Republican organ decried Gen. C. F. SMITH, the hero of Fort Donelson, one of our most gallant and accomplished officers, as his deeds proved.

We ask if it is right that such "a fire in the rear" should be kept up by a paper professing in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war, upon brave and skillful officers, who are risking life and health in behalf of their country? It is very easy for an editor to set upon an easy chair and unjustly criticize the officers of the army, but by weakening the confidence of the people in their ability and integrity is not using the most effective means to prevent enlistments?

Two Speeches at Washington—Master and Man—A Strange Contrast.

We published yesterday, side by side on the same page, two speeches delivered at Washington, presenting a very remarkable contrast; one of them constitutional, statesmanlike and grand—the speech of the Chief Magistrate of the Republic; the other violent, scurrilous and silly—the speech of the late American Minister to Russia. One speech was calculated to do good, the other infinite mischief. The speech of the President to the delegation of colored men at the White House was sagacious and wise. It proclaimed a great truth—that the difference between the black and white races in the United States is so broad that it is impossible the inferior race can ever possess political equality with the superior and dominant race. The two races can not exist in freedom together, for even at the North, where no legal servitude exists, the black man is practically and substantially as much a slave as he is at the South. Hence the President says:

"When you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. You are cut off from many of the advantages which the other race enjoy. The aspiration of men is to enjoy equality with the best when free, but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you."

This is honest. To be the servant of the white man, in some shape or other, is the normal condition of the negro everywhere in the United States, and those of the race who feel discontented at their inevitable lot have no other remedy than voluntary emigration and colonization—a remedy, however, which only a very small portion of the negroes are willing to adopt. The President does not believe in arming the negroes to free them from the white man's yoke, because he knows it would fail if attempted, and in the end would bring horror and death upon the heads of the blacks, and because he knows that the condition of the negro would not be improved by re-

leasing him from the restraints of legal servitude. Hence, too, the President does not see how the negro is to be bettered by emancipating him by proclamation and leaving him to shift for himself among a superior race.

How different are the language and spirit of Cassius M. Clay. This man, born in the same State with Mr. Lincoln, takes an entirely different view. He is impractical and visionary like all the Abolitionists. He does not believe in colonization, because it would delay emancipation, and yet he says he never was in favor of immediate emancipation, and is only now in favor of it because it is a time of war. But if the policy was not good in time of peace, war can not essentially change it. Mr. Clay must be aware of the policy of the Government and the sentiment of the country, and yet he publicly runs counter to both, while he is mean enough to retain office under the Administration. He left his post in Russia to become a Major General in the army, but because the President will not make the war one of emancipation and arm the negroes he tells the world he declines to have anything to do with it, and does his worst to prevent enlistments for the army. He says "it is sweet to die for a principle that is world-wide and eternal in its duration—universal liberty to mankind." He holds that blacks are naturally equal to white men, and quotes the Declaration of Independence that God has created all men free and equal, ignoring the fact that those who drew up that document never thought of including negroes. Otherwise they stuffed themselves. It was purely a white man's Government that was founded by Washington, Jefferson and their countrymen. Mr. Clay alludes to the case of the *Czar* freeing twenty millions of serfs. But these are of the same race as the *Czar* himself and the highest nobles in the land. There is no parity of reasoning, therefore, in the case. The serfs and the Russian serfs are slaves of the highest freedom and civilization. Not so the American negroes.

Again: Abraham Lincoln is not a despot, that he could do as he pleases in defiance of the will of American people, even if he believes in the policy of universal emancipation. What must we think of Mr. Clay's patriotism, when he is capable of uttering such language as the following: "Well, now you are going to conquer the South. How? By my friend Seward taking dinner and drinks? [Laughter and applause.] You are going to conquer the South by taking the sword in one hand and shackles in the other. You are going to conquer the South with our own sword of force, while the other is detailed to guard rebel property. You are so magnanimous that you are going to put down this gigantic effort at our own life and limb. The sword of Jim Lane, by fighting their battles and your own." [Applause.] How long have you tried it? For nearly eighteen months. Some of the best men in this country have gone down to their graves. Two hundred and fifty thousand of the loyal troops of the United States have died on the battlefield or been disabled by sickness. How many millions have you expended? Why, a sum rolling up to one thousand millions—almost one-fourth the national debt of England, that has been accumulating for ages—still you have been carrying on the war. Upon such principles as that you cannot stand upright in the eyes of the world. On these principles you never can conquer, and I am told by men high in power that the capital is still in danger. Gentlemen, how much longer is this thing to continue? As for myself, never, so help me God, will I draw a sword to keep the chains upon another fellow being. Tremendous applause! Suppose, gentlemen, that you succeed upon the present policy, what have you gained? Better recognize the Southern Confederacy at once, and stop this effusion of blood, and continue in the present ruinous policy, or have even a restoration of the Union as it was. Change your policy and say that you are in earnest. Send an ambassador to me, if you will, much as the slaveholders hate me, and I will send you a message that will tell you how I feel about the rebels who lay down their arms and come again under the protection of the old flag and Constitution, that protection which I will not withhold from any man, but if necessary I will destroy the whole South.

Mr. Clay then draws a terrible picture of our debt and bankruptcy, says he can never conquer, and swears that he will never draw a sword to fight for the Union as it was and the old Constitution. He proposes to recognize the Southern Confederacy at once and stop the effusion of blood by sending him an ambassador to Jeff Davis. This is extraordinary language for our ex-Minister to Russia and a candidate for the office of Major General. We hope Mr. Sew and Mr. Stanton will look to this man. His speech proves him unfit either for civil or military service. He is a man who will do nothing but say nothing wrong. Will he be permitted to go back to Russia, and will our important interests at the sagacious Court of St. Petersburg be entrusted to a man who is so deficient in common sense and sound judgment, and who has so evidently overthrown his ill balanced judgment?

What does Cassius M. Clay want? He desires to arm the negroes and despoil the South; to "make a sword of the sword," and to do this upon the very heels of the news from Hilton Head that Hunter's negro brigade is an utter failure and is broken up—one half of the regiment having been killed, and the other half, after deserting, having come home in the *Arago*.

There is abundant employment for the negroes in this war. Let not only Southern, but all the Northern negroes be put to work in digging trenches, in building fortifications, in carrying the charge of the ambulances and the wounded, cooking and other operations of the camp and the field upon which it is now necessary to employ white soldiers, greatly diminishing the efficiency of the army. Let the blacks be put to this kind of service, and their labors will become more valuable than if they were armed. But never let weapons be put into the hands of a race not destined for political equality.

The difference between the *Journal* and these men is that he is practical, and besides, adheres to the Constitution. They are always in the clouds, would overthrow the Constitution and launch the republic, without chart, compass or rudder, upon a sea of anarchy. But Mr. Clay and men like him ought not to be permitted to assail the war, to discourage enlistments, and to sow the seeds of strife and division at the North, when thorough union is absolutely essential to success.—*N. Y. Herald*.

From the Sullivan Democrat.

A Roubreak.

"We have learned long ago not to make assertions without founding them on reliable authority." This is the definite language of the editor of *Terre Haute Express*, in his article of the 13th inst., holding up the infamous falsehood that Hon. D. W. Voorhees is excluding his friends from the ballot until after the election. The editor says that the statement "was derived from Benj. Sherman of Sullivan county," and that "Mr. Sherman is represented to be as highly respectable and truthful a man as I have ever known." Let us see what the truth is. Mr. Sherman is a man of unquestionable integrity. From the following card addressed to us, it will be seen that this "highly respectable and truthful man" is a notorious liar and a confirmed liar.

CORRECTION.—Mr. BRIGGS: I noticed an article in the *Terre Haute Express* of yesterday morning, in which I am related to as the author of the statement made by that paper some two weeks ago to the effect that Hon. D. W. Voorhees had been exhorting his friends not to volunteer until after the fall election, in order that he might be secured by his friends' enemies. The assertion is an infamous falsehood. I have not heard Mr. Voorhees say a word on the subject of volunteers, nor have I spoken to him since the war was commenced. Through a political opponent of Mr. Voorhees, I feel called on to contradict this falsehood.

By giving this an insertion and requesting the editor of the *Express*, with whom I have no acquaintance whatever, to copy it, you will oblige.

Yours, truly, BENJ. C. SHERMAN.

Sullivan, August 14, 1862.

"We understand that there was a very large meeting at Poland, in Clay county, yesterday. Hon. D. W. Voorhees made one of his best efforts, after which about forty came forward and volunteered."—*Terre Haute Journal*.

There is a general exaltation of honor and disgust from all loyal patriots in the country at Wendell Phillips' abominable treason speech at Abington. Are they deaf at Washington that they do not see his lie—Boston Post.

The Abolitionists are resolved to oppose the war unless the negroes are armed to take part in it. Each man of them desires, in case he loses the fight, to have a nigger in front of him.—*Lawrence Journal*.

Speech of Hon. Wm. M. McCarty at the Democratic Convention in Shelby County.

Judge McCarty said: He had gloomy forebodings for the future of the country. The order of this civil war is to test the stability of our Government, and the fitness of our people for self-government. It will show us whether we are worthy for life and property—with commerce, agriculture, and the arts all flourishing—with every element of wealth and prosperity around us—a part of society thus blessed shall attempt to reverse this picture, and crumble to a heap of ruins our institutions, we may well have ground for doubt. If the demons of discord and hate are too potent for fraternal love—if bigotry is to master tolerance—if frenzied madness is to rule over reason and statesmanship—if conservatism is to yield to fanaticism—anchored by statute for law—mob to riot in licentiousness, the fate of the republic are then numbered. We all have a common stake in the future destiny of our Government—all owe the military duty of crushing treason against it, and all owe the political duty of preserving and maintaining it. And here let me say he would exclude his co-rebel from his voice and weight in the legislative and executive departments, and in the spirit of the despot and not of the republican; and he would become the slavish echo of power, or would abdicate his political rights and duties, or suffer them to be wrested from him. The free man would not be a slave, and here, as Democratic loyalty has been impeached and libeled, let me run a parallel between Democratic loyalty and the loyalty of others—not to eliminate others, but to vindicate the Democratic principle. The Democratic principle is to be faithful to the Constitution and the laws. This is the test, as law is the only sovereign in a republic, we owe no allegiance to Mr. Lincoln—we owe it to his Constitution and its provisions only. The annulment of the whole Constitution (as done by the South) are acts of disloyalty; but the annulment of any part of it is equally an act of disloyalty. Abolitionists have advocated a higher law than the Constitution, and one at war with it. Where the power to annul laws is in conflict with the Federal power? It may be in bayonets, or it may be in the sayings of Senators, that in war may be silent. In other words, to destroy a rebellion we must resort to revolution; to protect, we must violate; to preserve, we must destroy.

My friend Owen, whose eye like the poet's "in a fine phrening rolling glances from earth," is "to heaven," to "foot-prints" on its confines, for emancipation, never to be in the hands of chimeras for human happiness. I do not question his motives—but save in and by revolution where is the warrant of power in the Federal Government as against a loyal slaveholder to the State of Indiana? This is the question we must work for; but where is the power to annul State laws not in conflict with the Federal power? It may be in bayonets, or it may be in the sayings of Senators, that in war may be silent. In other words, to destroy a rebellion we must resort to revolution; to protect, we must violate; to preserve, we must destroy.

No one will pretend that war adds to or subtracts from the Constitution, and where will you find power in the hands of the President to withhold the army in time of peace (or war) to destroy slavery in the States, and yet the *Tribune* and kindred papers say that the war will not terminate until slavery, its existing cause, is abolished.

Are all constitutional limitations upon power and all guarantees to be blotted out under the cloak of enforcing law against rebel subjects. Let me ask you if there is not as much loyalty in fighting to preserve a legal institution as to overthrow it? Is not the argument of the Secretary of the Navy and late Secretary of War, for manning our ships and garrisoning our forts south with negroes, because the negroes are deadly to the rebels, an argument for their use in cotton and rice fields? Does the character of the allowed work vary the crime of servitude? Is there much less danger or less despotism in one than in the other? If the negroes are deadly to the rebels, why not let them be deadly to the rebels? Labor is sold by Government, where is the advantage right and wrong? If a slaveholder would use negroes for service labor, but do not degrade the soldiers to the perdition of negroes for risk the country of history by that savage and inhuman slaughter of men, women and children of the slaves of St. Domingo were guilty. In vain does history teach by example, if we do not profit by its lessons. There are some other lessons of the French revolution written in blood, which will vindicate the liberty of speech, not as a right, but as a duty "in times of peace and in times of war," as a legacy which, if he left no other, he would bequeath his children. And you also know that John Jay, who was a man of Liberty, once knelt and swore eternal hostility to every letter upon human thought and human conscience, and his great battle against, and victory over, the alien and sedition law, was for the freedom of speech and the right of dissent.

When our forts were seized and our mints plundered, piracy on the high seas inaugurated, our capital threatened, I felt that I was a co-heir of this Government, one of the guardians of its rights, and a sturdy defender of its laws, and an oath of allegiance on my conscience to uphold the Constitution, enforce the laws and preserve the Union, and my voice was raised for the war. But I never dreamed that this one duty of well known honor, and of moral and political rights or duties or that Democracy and loyalty were so in conflict that they could not co-exist.

If men believe that Democracy so passes their faith and conscience that they can not fight it, it is an argument against it; if it so impoverishes their purse that they can not do with money, it is an argument against it; if it so burdens their faculties and unites them for legislation, it is an argument against it. Does it destroy the immutability of principle? Does it make truth a lie? Is the head robbed of its wisdom or the heart of its patriotism? If so then this self-stultification and the degradation of Democracy is a day. But I fear no such were never inoculated with genuine Democratic matter.

The Democracy nerves the heart to battle for the great chart of our liberties, the Constitution, in the hands of the rebels, and the political arena the motive is as hallowed, the duty as imperative, in the one case as in the other. Now the protection of slavery was the price of the Union, and it is essential to its preservation as it was to its maintenance. Let the blacks be put to work in digging trenches, in building fortifications, in carrying the charge of the ambulances and the wounded, cooking and other operations of the camp and the field upon which it is now necessary to employ white soldiers, greatly diminishing the efficiency of the army. Let the blacks be put to this kind of service, and their labors will become more valuable than if they were armed. But never let weapons be put into the hands of a race not destined for political equality.

The difference between the *Journal* and these men is that he is practical, and besides, adheres to the Constitution. They are always in the clouds, would overthrow the Constitution and launch the republic, without chart, compass or rudder, upon a sea of anarchy. But Mr. Clay and men like him ought not to be permitted to assail the war, to discourage enlistments, and to sow the seeds of strife and division at the North, when thorough union is absolutely essential to success.—*N. Y. Herald*.

From the Sullivan Democrat.

A Roubreak.

"We have learned long ago not to make assertions without founding them on reliable authority." This is the definite language of the editor of *Terre Haute Express*, in his article of the 13th inst., holding up the infamous falsehood that Hon. D. W. Voorhees is excluding his friends from the ballot until after the election. The editor says that the statement "was derived from Benj. Sherman of Sullivan county," and that "Mr. Sherman is represented to be as highly respectable and truthful a man as I have ever known." Let us see what the truth is. Mr. Sherman is a man of unquestionable integrity. From the following card addressed to us, it will be seen that this "highly respectable and truthful man" is a notorious liar and a confirmed liar.

CORRECTION.—Mr. BRIGGS: I noticed an article in the *Terre Haute Express* of yesterday morning, in which I am related to as the author of the statement made by that paper some two weeks ago to the effect that Hon. D. W. Voorhees had been exhorting his friends not to volunteer until after the fall election, in order that he might be secured by his friends' enemies. The assertion is an infamous falsehood. I have not heard Mr. Voorhees say a word on the subject of volunteers, nor have I spoken to him since the war was commenced. Through a political opponent of Mr. Voorhees, I feel called on to contradict this falsehood.

By giving this an insertion and requesting the editor of the *Express*, with whom I have no acquaintance whatever, to copy it, you will oblige.

Yours, truly, BENJ. C. SHERMAN.

Sullivan, August 14, 1862.

"We understand that there was a very large meeting at Poland, in Clay county, yesterday. Hon. D. W. Voorhees made one of his best efforts, after which about forty came forward and volunteered."—*Terre Haute Journal*.

There is a general exaltation of honor and disgust from all loyal patriots in the country at Wendell Phillips' abominable treason speech at Abington. Are they deaf at Washington that they do not see his lie—Boston Post.

The Abolitionists are resolved to oppose the war unless the negroes are armed to take part in it. Each man of them desires, in case he loses the fight, to have a nigger in front of him.—*Lawrence Journal*.

question—suffice it that it is a covert and disguised levy of revenue by which the tax-payer pays to Government the duty on imported goods, and sometimes to some individual or corporation, the amount of the duty when not imported, in the shape of price for goods, wares, &c. The tribute so Government we may cheerfully pay—but we will not contribute to the overgrown fortunes of the Lawrence and Eastern factories.

The present tariff being almost prohibitory in its character, the tribute and tax under it is almost exclusively paid to individuals. The significant facts, that we go to the East for all large loans—that the interest on money there is but about one-half what it is in the West—that the factories are realizing larger profits and dividends there, while the manufacturers of the West are impoverished—that we pay more for nearly every article in our shops and stores and get so much less for our products, tells the story of partial and unjust legislation, and yet your factories are excluded from a Southern market, as well as our bacon, flour, &c.; and if your members of Congress are so ignorant of the science of political economy, or guilty of that infidelity to equal justice as to allow the East the markets of the West as against the West, they are not fit to represent you in the councils of the nation unless you desire by stress of legislation money to be filched from your pockets to enrich men much more wicked than the Treasury. The Treasury need for the protective system do not rise to the dignity of arguments. The West must be and I predict will be uniting this conviction of importance will open their eyes to Republican misrule.

My friend Owen, whose eye like the poet's "in a fine phrening rolling glances from earth," is "to heaven," to "foot-prints" on its confines, for emancipation, never to be in the hands of chimeras for human happiness. I do not question his motives—but save in and by revolution where is the warrant of power in the Federal Government as against a loyal slaveholder to the State of Indiana? This is the question we must work for; but where is the power to annul State laws not in conflict with the Federal power? It may be in bayonets, or it may be in the sayings of Senators, that in war may be silent. In other words, to destroy a rebellion we must resort to revolution; to protect, we must violate; to preserve, we must destroy.

No one will pretend that war adds to or subtracts from the Constitution, and where will you find power in the hands of the President to withhold the army in time of peace (or war) to destroy slavery in the States, and yet the *Tribune* and kindred papers say that the war will not terminate until slavery, its existing cause, is abolished.

Are all constitutional limitations upon power and all guarantees to be blotted out under the cloak of enforcing law against rebel subjects. Let me ask you if there is not as much loyalty in fighting to preserve a legal institution as to overthrow it? Is not the argument of the Secretary of the Navy and late Secretary of War, for manning our ships and garrisoning our forts south with negroes, because the negroes are deadly to the rebels, an argument for their use in cotton and rice fields? Does the character of the allowed work vary the crime of servitude? Is there much less danger or less despotism in one than in the other? If the negroes are deadly to the rebels, why not let them be deadly to the rebels? Labor is sold by Government, where is the advantage right and wrong? If a slaveholder would use negroes for service labor, but do not degrade the soldiers to the perdition of negroes for risk the country of history by that savage and inhuman slaughter of men, women and children of the slaves of St. Domingo were guilty. In vain does history teach by example, if we do not profit by its lessons. There are some other lessons of the French revolution written in blood, which will vindicate the liberty of speech, not as a right, but as a duty "in times of peace and in times of war," as a legacy which, if he left no other, he would bequeath his children. And you also know that John Jay, who was a man of Liberty, once knelt and swore eternal hostility to every letter upon human thought and human conscience, and his great battle against, and victory over, the alien and sedition law, was for the freedom of speech and the right of dissent.

When our forts were seized and our mints plundered, piracy on the high seas inaugurated, our capital threatened, I felt that I was a co-heir of this Government, one of the guardians of its rights, and a sturdy defender of its laws, and an oath of allegiance on my conscience to uphold the Constitution, enforce the laws and preserve the Union, and my voice was raised for the war. But I never dreamed that this one duty of well known honor, and of moral and political rights or duties or that Democracy and loyalty were so in conflict that they could not co-exist.

If men believe that Democracy so passes their faith and conscience that they can not fight it, it is an argument against it; if it so impoverishes their purse that they can not do with money, it is an argument against it; if it so burdens their faculties and unites them for legislation, it is an argument against it. Does it destroy the immutability of principle? Does it make truth a lie? Is the head robbed of its wisdom or the heart of its patriotism? If so then this self-stultification and the degradation of Democracy is a day. But I fear no such were never inoculated with genuine Democratic matter.

The Democracy nerves the heart to battle for the great chart of our liberties, the Constitution, in the hands of the rebels, and the political arena the motive is as hallowed, the duty as imperative, in the one case as in the other. Now the protection of slavery was the price of the Union, and it is essential to its preservation as it was to its maintenance. Let the blacks be put to work in digging trenches, in building fortifications, in carrying the charge of the ambulances and the wounded, cooking and other operations of the camp and the field upon which it is now necessary to employ white soldiers, greatly diminishing the efficiency of the army. Let the blacks be put to this kind of service, and their labors will become more valuable than if they were armed. But never let weapons be put into the hands of a race not destined for political equality.

The difference between the *Journal* and these men is that he is practical, and besides, adheres to the Constitution. They are always in the clouds, would overthrow the Constitution and launch the republic, without chart, compass or rudder, upon a sea of anarchy. But Mr. Clay and men like him ought not to be permitted to assail the war, to discourage enlistments, and to sow the seeds of strife and division at the North, when thorough union is absolutely essential to success.—*N. Y. Herald*.

From the Sullivan Democrat.

A Roubreak.

"We have learned long ago not to make assertions without founding them on reliable authority." This is the definite language of the editor of *Terre Haute Express*, in his article of the 13th inst., holding up the infamous falsehood that Hon. D. W. Voorhees is excluding his friends from the ballot until after the election. The editor says that the statement "was derived from Benj. Sherman of Sullivan county," and that "Mr. Sherman is represented to be as highly respectable and truthful a man as I have ever known." Let us see what the truth is. Mr. Sherman is a man of unquestionable integrity. From the following card addressed to us, it will be seen that this "highly respectable and truthful man" is a notorious liar and a confirmed liar.

CORRECTION.—Mr. BRIGGS: I noticed an article in the *Terre Haute Express* of yesterday morning, in which I am related to as the author of the statement made by that paper some two weeks ago to the effect that Hon. D. W. Voorhees had been exhorting his friends not to volunteer until after the fall election, in order that he might be secured by his friends' enemies. The assertion is an infamous falsehood. I have not heard Mr. Voorhees say a word on the subject of volunteers, nor have I spoken to him since the war was commenced. Through a political opponent of Mr. Voorhees, I feel called on to contradict this falsehood.

By giving this an insertion and requesting the editor of the *Express*, with whom I have no acquaintance whatever, to copy it, you will oblige.

Yours, truly, BENJ. C. SHERMAN.

Sullivan, August 14, 1862.

"We understand that there was a very large meeting at Poland, in Clay county, yesterday. Hon. D. W. Voorhees made one of his best efforts, after which about forty came forward and volunteered."—*Terre Haute Journal*.

There is a general exaltation of honor and disgust from all loyal patriots in the country at Wendell Phillips' abominable treason speech at Abington. Are they deaf at Washington that they do not see his lie—Boston Post.

The Abolitionists are resolved to oppose the war unless the negroes are armed to take part in it. Each man of them desires, in case he loses the fight, to have a nigger in front of him.—*Lawrence Journal*.

LEGAL.

STATE OF INDIANA, MARION COUNTY, ss.—In the Common Pleas Court of Marion County, in the State of Indiana, October Term, A. D. 1862.—William Muir vs. Nathan Taylor.

It is known that on the 10th day of June in the year 1862, the above named plaintiff by his attorneys, filed in the office of the Clerk of the Common Pleas Court of Marion County his complaint against said defendant, in the above entitled case, together with an affidavit of a competent person, that said defendant, Nathan Taylor, is not a resident of the State of Indiana.

Said defendant is hereby notified of the filing and pendency of said complaint against him, and that unless he appear and answer or demur thereto at the calling of said cause on the second day of the next term of said Court, to be begun and held at the Court House, in the City of Indianapolis, on the first Monday in October next, said complaint, and the matters and things therein contained and alleged, will be heard and determined in his absence by the Court.

TAYLOR & TAYLOR, Attorneys for Plaintiff.

Aug 19-1862

COLD PENS.

GOLD PENS!! GOLD PENS!!

We are constantly receiving new stocks of Pens, manufactured by

L. W. FAIRCHILD

—AND—

DAWSON, WARREN & HYDE,

Put in a variety of new styles of cases, boxes, &c., for convenience.

DRY GOODS, NOTIONS, & C.

Webb, Kennedy & Co.,

Wholesale Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods, Notions, and Gen's Furnishing Goods.

Old Post Office Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

WHISKY.

J. C. DUNCAN

FOUR CORN, KENTUCKY, HAVE opened a bottle house in this city, on the corner of Illinois and Maryland streets, for the sale of genuine, unadulterated, copper distilled Old Bourbon Whisky. The reputation of the *Wagoner* is a sufficient guarantee for the purity of the liquors sold.

W. H. MAHAN, Agent.

Indianapolis, Aug. 4, 1862. aug 10-1m

MERCHANT TAILOR.

W. F. RUFF,

MERCHANT TAILOR.

Dealer in Ready-Made Clothing and Gen's Furnishing Goods.

No. 105 East Washington Street.

(OPPOSITE THE COURT HOUSE.)

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

aug 19

GROCERIES.

Ruger & Caldwell,

WHOLESALE GROCERS

—AND—

COMMISSION MERCHANTS,

No. 68 East Washington St.

Free Store East of Old Police Hall, Ind., Indianapolis, Indiana.

200 BARRELS Crushed Sugar;

200 BARRELS Crushed Sugar;

200 BARRELS Powdered Sugar;